United Nations A/62/701/Corr.1

General Assembly

Distr.: General
14 March 2008

Original: English

Sixty-second session
Agenda items 126 and 128

Review of the efficiency of the administrative and financial functioning of the United Nations

Programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009

Accountability framework, enterprise risk management and internal control framework, and results-based management framework

Report of the Secretary-General

Corrigendum

1. Replace figure I with the figure below.

08-27194 (E) 140308

Figure I
Accountability architecture

OVERALL OVERSIGHT: MEMBER STATES

ACCOUNTABILITY ARCHITECTURE OF THE UNITED NATIONS SECRETARIAT

ACHIEVEMENT OF RESULTS

MANAGEMENT OF RISK*

TRANSPARENCY

Integrity

- United Nations Charter
- Financial Disclosure
- Protection against retaliation
- Ethics Training
- Conflict Mediation
- New system of internal justice
- Standards of behaviour in the workplace such as:
- Standards of Conduct for International civil servants
- Prevention of workplace harassment, Sexual harassment and Abuse of authority

***Responsible Parties (Secretariat)*:**

- Ethics Office
- Ombudsman
- New system of internal justice

Performance

***Statement of expected results*:**

- Legislative mandates
- Vision Statements
- Strategic Plans
- Budgets
- Senior Managers' Compacts
- Office and Section workplans
- Individual workplans
- Human Resources action Plans
- Risk registry*

***Assessment of results*:**

- Management Performance Board's assessment of senior management performance
- Performance appraisal of staff
- Senior managers' compacts
- Financial and human resources reporting to Member States
- Programme performance report
- Evaluation reports

***Responsible Parties (Secretariat)*:**

- Secretary-General
- Senior Managers
- Management Performance Board
- Office of Human Resources Management
- Office of Programme Planning, Budget and Accounts

***Responsible Parties (others)*:**

- General Assembly
- Security Council
- ECOSOC
- ACABQ
- CPC

Compliance and Oversight

- Financial Regulations and Rules including Procurement Regulations and Rules
- Staff Regulations and Rules
- Programme Planning, Budgeting, Monitoring and Evaluation rules
- Accounting Standards
- Monitoring of Delegation of Authority
- Audits
- New Bid protest system

***Responsible Parties (Secretariat)*:**

- Department of Management
- Office of Internal Oversight Services
- Management Committee
- Vendor Review Committee

***Responsible Parties (other)*:**

- Board of Auditors
- Joint Inspection Unit
- IAAC

* Proposed pilot project.

2. Replace annex I with the annex below.

Annex I

Summary of accountability survey results

Topic	Sub-Topic	Question	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral / No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know / Can't Answer	Rating
Mission Alignment	Clarity of Roles	I understand the mission and purpose of my current organizational unit	45%	45%	5%	3%	1%	1%	●
		I understand my own role and responsibilities	47%	43%	5%	3%	2%	0%	●
		I understand the effect that my work has on UN programmes or operations	40%	44%	9%	4%	2%	1%	●
		I understand the roles and responsibilities of my supervisor(s) and co-workers	29%	49%	10%	7%	5%	0%	●
	Self-efficacy	I feel effective in my job	38%	43%	9%	7%	3%	0%	●
		I feel that my suggestions about changes or improvements are taken seriously	10%	28%	24%	22%	14%	2%	○
Capacity and Tools	Training	I feel that I have access to adequate traning opportunities within the UN System	10%	34%	22%	21%	12%	1%	○
		I have obtained adequate training to support me in my current position	11%	38%	21%	21%	9%	1%	○
		My current training opportunities are linked to my desired career goals	8%	29%	28%	22%	11%	3%	○

* Please note that these statements are on a reverse scale

Source: Accountability Framework Survey

Source: Accountability Framework Survey

Key: Strength ↕ Weakness
● Strongly Agree + Agree Approx >50%
○ Agree + Neutral + Disagree Approx >60%
● Disagree + Strongly Disagree Approx >50%

Topic	Sub-Topic	Question	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral / No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know / Can't Answer	Rating
Capacity and Tools (cont.)	Accountability	I feel that I may be held responsible for something that is not in my control*	14%	34%	23%	21%	5%	2%	○
		I feel confident that my supervisor(s) have the appropriate tools and information to make good decisions	9%	32%	23%	21%	13%	2%	○
		I feel that I may be held responsible for something for which I am not adequately equipped*	12%	29%	29%	23%	6%	2%	○
	Resources	I have sufficient financial resources to do my job	8%	37%	22%	21%	9%	3%	●
		I have sufficient human resources to do my job	8%	33%	19%	26%	11%	2%	○
Recognition		I feel that I am adequately recognized for my performance	10%	38%	15%	23%	15%	1%	○
		I believe that I am appropriately recognized for suggesting new ideas or taking new direction	7%	30%	23%	25%	14%	2%	○
Motivation and Performance	Leadership	I feel that management is able to effectively help any underperforming workers to improve their performance or contributions	6%	17%	20%	33%	23%	1%	◎
		I trust my supervisor(s) to fairly evaluate my performance	12%	40%	19%	15%	12%	1%	●
		I feel the performance appraisal system is taken seriously by my supervisor(s)	8%	24%	23%	21%	20%	4%	○

* Please note that these statements are on a reverse scale

Source: Accountability Framework Survey

Key: Strength ↕ Weakness

● Strongly Agree + Agree Approx >50%

○ Agree + Neutral + Disagree Approx >60%

◎ Disagree + Strongly Disagree Approx >50%

Topic	Sub-Topic	Question	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral / No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know / Can't Answer	Rating
Motivation and Performance (cont.)	Motivation	Overall, I feel motivated to work hard in my position	21%	42%	13%	16%	7%	0%	●
		I feel that high performing staff are appropriately rewarded (e.g., recognitions, promotion opportunities)	3%	10%	17%	36%	32%	2%	○
	ePAS	I feel that meeting administrative requirements is considered more important than meeting the programme or operational objectives*	18%	35%	27%	14%	3%	4%	○
		I feel that ePAS provides an appropriate framework for documenting staff performance	5%	24%	19%	26%	23%	4%	○
		Overall, I feel that the performance appraisal system is used appropriately to evaluate and document performance	3%	15%	19%	31%	28%	4%	○
		I feel the performance of staff is documented appropriately in ePAS	4%	16%	23%	30%	24%	5%	○
Advancement Opportunities		I believe that the best candidates are usually selected in the promotion process	2%	9%	20%	32%	33%	4%	○
		I believe that the senior management (ASGs and above) selection process is fair	1%	7%	35%	17%	21%	18%	○

* Please note that these statements are on a reverse scale

Source: Accountability Framework Survey

Key: Strength ↕ Weakness

● Strongly Agree + Agree Approx >50%

◐ Agree + Neutral + Disagree Approx >60%

○ Disagree + Strongly Disagree Approx >50%

Topic	Sub-Topic	Question	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral / No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know / Can't Answer	Trend
Change Readiness	Change Leadership	I believe that change in the UN is necessary for the UN to continue to fulfill its mission	53%	37%	7%	2%	1%	1%	●
		I generally believe that the UN has been slow to change*	44%	38%	11%	4%	1%	2%	◐
		I generally trust UN leadership and management to make the right decisions concerning change	5%	23%	30%	26%	14%	3%	◐
		I am confident that my supervisor(s) will make good decisions	7%	32%	27%	20%	12%	2%	◐
		I believe that the reasons for change are adequately communicated to me	3%	25%	28%	29%	13%	2%	◐
		I believe that the UN leadership and management are serious about change	5%	26%	32%	23%	11%	4%	◐
	Individual Change Readiness	I am generally in support of change, even if it means that the way I do my job or the way that I am appraised changes	35%	53%	9%	2%	1%	1%	●
		I believe that my co-workers generally support change	7%	37%	29%	17%	4%	6%	◐
		I generally view change as an opportunity	36%	49%	10%	3%	1%	1%	●

* Please note that these statements are on a reverse scale

Source: Accountability Framework Survey

Key: Strength ↕ Weakness
● Strongly Agree + Agree Approx >50%
○ Agree + Neutral + Disagree Approx >60%
◐ Disagree + Strongly Disagree Approx >50%

3. Replace annex II with the annex below.

Annex II

Applying risk to audit planning

Impact	Likelihood: Low	Likelihood: High
High	***Tier 2 – secondary risks*** These risks are difficult to predict, but can be catastrophic if they occur. **Level of risk**: high **Likelihood**: low **Treatment**: monitor level of risk and risk controls **Type of control activity**: detective **Internal audit focus**: moderate to high, second highest percentage of audit plan	***Tier 1 – primary risks*** These risks are perceived to be of greatest importance and critical to meeting organizational objectives. **Level of risk**: high **Likelihood**: high **Treatment**: ongoing monitoring and improvement **Type of control activity**: preventive and detective **Internal audit focus**: high, highest percentage of audit plan
Low	***Tier 3 – tertiary risks*** These risks are infrequent and not severe. They are often less predictable, but not significant or likely to occur. **Level of risk**: low **Likelihood**: low **Treatment**: accept risk **Type of control activity**: minimal preventive and detective **Internal audit focus**: low, only as considered necessary	***Tier 2 – secondary risks*** These risks are frequent and relatively routine. Monitoring considerations are to provide assurance that they continue to be properly managed. **Level of risk**: low to moderate **Likelihood**: moderate to high **Treatment**: monitor level of risk **Type of control activity**: preventive **Internal audit focus**: low, lowest percentage of audit plan

Likelihood

The chart above illustrates how risk may be reflected within an audit plan, using the inherent risk and impact identified within the risk assessment process.

Note that the expected accomplishments for the Internal Audit Division of the Office of Internal Oversight Services refer to risk. Furthermore, the indicator of achievement measures management acceptance of "critical audit recommendations".[a]

[a] A/62/6 (Sect. 29), table 29.7, items (b) and (c).

The definition of "critical" was established by the General Assembly in its resolution 56/246. It provides static (e.g., a $25,000 threshold for savings, recoveries, etc.) as well as subjective criteria (e.g., measurable improvements to process) for the determination of critical items. The Assembly also invited the Office to further refine the criteria. The definition of "critical" within the enterprise risk management and internal control framework should move towards relative measures that apply the risk appetite and tolerance levels agreed by the Assembly, and therefore better reflect the appropriate relative prioritization of risks as identified from managements' risk assessment efforts.